Message

From: waltermugdan@aol.com [waltermugdan@aol.com]
Sent: 12/12/2010 12:05:51 AM
To: Garbarini.Doug@epamail.epa.gov; stugbawa@louisberger.com; egarvey@louisberger.com; Mugdan.Walter@epamail.epa.gov
CC: Conetta.Benny@epamail.epa.gov; bfidler@louisberger.com; King.David@epamail.epa.gov; Klawinski.Gary@epamail.epa.gov; simon.paul@epa.gov; schaaf.eric@epa.gov; fischer.douglas@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Summary of Discussion about Resuspension Standards
Attachments: Resuspension Standard Proposals.docx

See attached document in which I have attempted to summarize where we are on the Resuspension standards. (I believe Solomon is working on incorporating these concepts into the document.) We will discuss these with GE at 9 AM on Sunday; we'll also discuss the capping Metric of Success during that call.

The call-in number for the Sunday morning call is **Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)**

-----Original Message-----
From: Garbarini.Doug <Garbarini.Doug@epamail.epa.gov>
To: Gbondo-Tugbawa, Solomon <stugbawa@louisberger.com>; egarvey <egarvey@louisberger.com>; Mugdan.Walter <Mugdan.Walter@epamail.epa.gov>; waltermugdan <waltermugdan@aol.com>
Cc: Conetta.Benny <Conetta.Benny@epamail.epa.gov>; Fidler, Bruce <bfidler@louisberger.com>; King.David <King.David@epamail.epa.gov>; Klawinski.Gary <Klawinski.Gary@epamail.epa.gov>
Sent: Sat, Dec 11, 2010 5:30 pm
Subject: RE: Effect of Longer Block Average and High Flow on Resuspension Load Standard

Please call the hudson team numb er at 5:30

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

From: "Gbondo-Tugbawa, Solomon" <stugbawa@louisberger.com>
To: Benny Conetta/R2/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "Fidler, Bruce" <bfidler@louisberger.com>, David King/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Doug Garbarini/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Gary Klawinski/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, "Atmadja, Juliana" <jatmadja@louisberger.com>, "Bilimoria, Maheyar" <mbilimoria@louisberger.com>, Paul Simon/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, "McDonald, Shane" <smcdonald@louisberger.com>, Walter Mugdan/R2/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 12/11/2010 03:57 PM
Subject: RE: Effect of Longer Block Average and High Flow on Resuspension Load Standard

Here's a brief summary (see Table below)
Note that period used for the running average was applied to both the load and the flows.

1) No significant differences between the total number of exceedances for 14-day running average (GE's proposal) vs. 7-day running average.
2) At TI, the majority of the exceedances occurred between 5,000 to 7500 cfs. At average flows < 5,000 cfs, no exceedance occurred.
3) At Waterford doing a longer average period (21 days or 28 days) == get out of jail free card.
4) Stopping the operation only when the standard is exceeded at flows > 7,500 cfs == get out of jail free card.

Station	14-day Exceedance Based on 7-day Running Average	14-day Exceedance Based on 14-day Running Average

	Total	Flow < 5000	Flow between 5000 and 7500	Flow >7500	Total	Flow < 5000	Flow between 5000 and 7500	Flow >7500
Lock 5	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
TID	16	0	14	2	14	0	14	0
Waterford	3	0	1	2	1	0	1	0

From: Conetta.Benny@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Conetta.Benny@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Saturday, December 11, 2010 2:11 PM
To: Gbondo-Tugbawa, Solomon
Cc: Fidler, Bruce; King.David@epamail.epa.gov; Garbarini.Doug@epamail.epa.gov; Klawinski.Gary@epamail.epa.gov; Atmadja, Juliana; Bilimoria, Maheyar; Simon.Paul@epamail.epa.gov; McDonald, Shane; Mugdan.Walter@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: RE: Effect of Longer Block Average and High Flow on Resuspension Load Standard

can you give a short summary of your findings?

-----"Gbondo-Tugbawa, Solomon" <stugbawa@louisberger.com> wrote: -----
To: Benny Conetta/R2/USEPA/US@EPA
From: "Gbondo-Tugbawa, Solomon" <stugbawa@louisberger.com>
Date: 12/11/2010 02:10PM
Cc: David King/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, "Fidler, Bruce" <bfidler@louisberger.com>, Doug Garbarini/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, Gary Klawinski/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, "Atmadja, Juliana" <jatmadja@louisberger.com>, "Bilimoria, Maheyar" <mbilimoria@louisberger.com>, "McDonald, Shane" <smcdonald@louisberger.com>, Walter Mugdan/R2/USEPA/US@EPA, "McDonald, Shane" <smcdonald@louisberger.com>, "Bilimoria, Maheyar" <mbilimoria@louisberger.com>, Paul Simon/R2/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: RE: Effect of Longer Block Average and High Flow on Resuspension Load Standard
Ben,

Using the Phase 1 data, I assessed the load standards at the far-field stations TI (2%), Lock 5 (2%) and Waterford (1%) using different running average basis as follows:

1) Estimated the number of "14 or more consecutive days", exceedances for load on a **7-day average basis** (this is what is in the standard currently).
2) Estimated the number of "14 or more consecutive days" exceedances for load on a **14-day average basis** (this is GE's proposal)
3) For Waterford an additional scenario of the number of "14 or more consecutive days" exceedances for load on a **28-day running average basis** was also considered (another GE proposal).
4) I categorized the number of exceedances into flow bins as follows: < 5,000 cfs, between 5,000 – 7,500 cfs, and > 7,500 cfs (Fort Edward Flow).

I will summarize the results during our call tomorrow.

Let me know if you need additional calculations done.